

Appendix 2 – ASB Strategy Consultation Outcome:

1. A total of 8 responses were received through the online survey, with the addition of views gathered at informal engagement in-person events, with many residents contributing valuable feedback and personal accounts, to accompany feedback from cases. Overall, there was support for the four strategic priorities outlined in the draft strategy.
2. In response to the priority Prevention and Early intervention feedback from the online consultation highlighted a strong need for youth-focused interventions. Many respondents felt that facilities such as youth centres, clubs, and outreach workers are essential for successful prevention and early intervention. Alongside this, practical measures were suggested to create safer environments and reduce opportunities for anti-social behaviour. These included improving lighting, considering property design, and deploying CCTV in areas where problems are most prevalent.
3. There was concern that the current wording, “prevent ASB where possible,” may appear too weak and fail to convey NFDC’s commitment to tackling persistent issues, such as noise from local businesses. Stronger language was recommended to demonstrate a proactive stance, such as “actively prevent and reduce ASB” or “take decisive action to address ASB.”
4. Finally, in person engagement expressed a desire to improve pride in gardens and communal spaces, recognising that well-maintained environments can foster a sense of ownership and community responsibility, which in turn supports prevention.
5. In response to the priority “Managing Risk and Supporting Victims” consultation responses most frequently emphasised the importance of supporting victims of anti-social behaviour, with many stating that this support is vital to stop victims living in fear of repeat incidents.
6. There was a strong call for outreach workers, who were seen as essential for managing risk and preventing incidents before they escalate. Practical measures were also suggested, including encouraging the use of CCTV or doorbell cameras and implementing Acceptable Behaviour Contracts to set clear expectations and boundaries.
7. Overall, respondents agreed that delivering this priority would make a significant difference in addressing complaints and taking effective action against anti-social behaviour. Feedback from in-person engagement reinforced these views, highlighting a desire to improve pride in gardens and communal spaces and expressing strong support for direct action against specific behaviours, particularly those linked to substance misuse.

8. In response to the priority “working in partnership” this priority consistently highlighted the importance of strong partnership working, particularly with the police, to ensure quicker responses and provide residents with clear guidance on who is responsible for dealing with anti-social behaviour. Some respondents stressed the need for better coordination during times when council offices are closed, such as weekends, to avoid delays in addressing urgent issues. While some responses referred to earlier points or offered limited additional comments, the dominant theme was a call for improved collaboration and clearer responsibilities across agencies.
9. With response to the priority “Putting Tenants First” respondents raised concerns about the language and focus of this priority, particularly around the perception that responsibility for managing anti-social behaviour might be shifted onto residents rather than being led by NFDC and its partners. There was also a call for clarity on whether support is available to all residents, not just council tenants, with some expressing concern that homeowners could be overlooked in favour of tenants.
10. One respondent commented that the strategy appeared overly broad and questioned what concrete actions are currently being taken, indicating a desire for greater focus and transparency.
11. Overall, the main themes were concerns about language implying resident responsibility.
12. Feedback from in-person engagement reinforced these views, with residents requesting faster response times to ASB reports from NFDC and partner organisations. This reflects a clear expectation that partnership working should not only be about shared responsibility but also about delivering timely and effective action.
13. The Community Hub event in Totton approximately 30 people attended the event at the church. Offices managed to speak with around 10 attendees during the event. three were tenants from NFDC properties. Conversations were generally positive, with some tenants sharing feedback about their housing experience and expressing interest in future engagement. Events in New Milton, Calshot and Pennington had similar attendance. Unfortunately, no questionnaires were completed during these sessions. The first part of the events was often spent addressing urgent matters raised by attendees and making introductions, which limited time for consultation activities. By the time event began, most attendees left after collecting shopping and food. The events were beneficial for relationship-building. Regular attendance could help establish trust and visibility, as tenants seemed to gravitate toward familiar faces from the tenancy engagement team and Neighbourhood Officer.

14. Feedback from Tenant Involvement group members reinforced these points, stressing that the strategy should offer support to tenants experiencing ASB regardless of the perpetrator's housing tenure, to avoid reinforcing the perception that action cannot be taken against non-social housing residents. Members also suggested standardising language throughout the strategy—particularly the use of “tenant” versus “resident” and “estate” versus “block”—to improve consistency and reduce stigma